

Original Dated January 25, 1995
(with correction to Page 9 dated February 10, 1995)

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Options for Limiting the Potential to Emit (PTE) of a Stationary Source Under Section 112 and Title V of the Clean Air Act (Act)

FROM: John S. Seitz, Director
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (MD-10)

Robert I. Van Heuvelen, Director
Office of Regulatory Enforcement (2241)

TO: Director, Air, Pesticides and Toxics
Management Division, Regions I and IV
Director, Air and Waste Management Division,
Region II
Director, Air, Radiation and Toxics Division,
Region III
Director, Air and Radiation Division,
Region V
Director, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Division,
Region VI
Director, Air and Toxics Division,
Regions VII, VIII, IX, and X

Many stationary source requirements of the Act apply only to "major" sources. Major sources are those sources whose emissions of air pollutants exceed threshold emissions levels specified in the Act. For instance, section 112 requirements such as MACT and section 112(g) and title V operating permit requirements largely apply only to sources with emissions that exceed specified levels and are thus major. To determine whether a source is major, the Act focuses not only on a source's actual emissions, but also on its potential emissions. Thus, a source that has maintained actual emissions at levels below the major source threshold could still be subject to major source requirements if it has the potential to emit major amounts of air pollutants. However, in situations where unrestricted operation of a source would result in a potential to emit above major-source levels, such sources may legally avoid program requirements by taking federally-enforceable permit conditions which limit emissions to levels below the applicable major

source threshold. Federally-enforceable permit conditions, if violated, are subject to enforcement by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or by citizens in addition to the State or Local agency.

As the deadlines for complying with MACT standards and title V operating permits approach, industry and State and local air pollution agencies have become increasingly focused on the need to adopt and implement federally-enforceable mechanisms to limit emissions from sources that desire to limit potential emissions to below major source levels. In fact, there are numerous options available which can be tailored by the States to provide such sources with simple and effective ways to qualify as minor sources. Because there appears to be some confusion and questions regarding how potential to emit limits may be established, EPA has decided to: (1) outline the available approaches to establishing potential to emit limitations, (2) describe developments related to the implementation of these various approaches, and (3) implement a transition policy that will allow certain sources to be treated as minor for a period of time sufficient for these sources to obtain a federally-enforceable limit.

Federal enforceability is an essential element of establishing limitations on a source's potential to emit. Federal enforceability ensures the conditions placed on emissions to limit a source's potential to emit are enforceable by EPA and citizens as a legal and practical matter, thereby providing the public with credible assurances that otherwise major sources are not avoiding applicable requirements of the Act. In order to ensure compliance with the Act, any approaches developed to allow sources to avoid the major source requirements must be supported by the Federal authorities granted to citizens and EPA. In addition, Federal enforceability provides source owners and operators with assurances that limitations they have obtained from a State or local agency will be recognized by EPA.

The concept of federal enforceability incorporates two separate fundamental elements that must be present in all limitations on a source's potential to emit. First, EPA must have a direct right to enforce restrictions and limitations imposed on a source to limit its exposure to Act programs. This requirement is based both on EPA's general interest in having the power to enforce "all relevant features of SIP's that are necessary for attainment and maintenance of NAAQS and PSD increments" (see 54 FR 27275, citing 48 FR 38748, August 25, 1983) as well as the specific goal of using national enforcement to ensure that the requirements of the Act are uniformly implemented throughout the nation (see 54 FR 27277). Second, limitations must be enforceable as a practical matter.

It is important to recognize that there are shared responsibilities on the part of EPA, State, and local agencies, and on source owners to create and implement approaches to creating acceptable limitations on potential emissions. The lead responsibility for developing limitations on potential emissions rests primarily with source owners and State and local agencies. At the same time, EPA must work together with interested parties, including industry and States to ensure that clear guidance is established and that timely Federal input, including Federal approval actions, is provided where appropriate. The guidance in this memorandum is aimed towards continuing and improving this partnership.

Available Approaches for Creating Federally-enforceable Limitations on the Potential to Emit

There is no single "one size fits all" mechanism that would be appropriate for creating federally-enforceable limitations on potential emissions for all sources in all situations. The spectrum of available mechanisms should, however, ensure that State and local agencies can create federally-enforceable limitations without undue administrative burden to sources or the agency. With this in mind, EPA views the following types of programs, if submitted to and approved by EPA, as available to agencies seeking to establish federally-enforceable potential to emit limits:¹

1. Federally-enforceable State operating permit programs (FESOPs) (non-title V). For complex sources with numerous and varying emission points, case-by-case permitting is generally needed for the establishment of limitations on the source's potential to emit. Such case-by-case permitting is often accomplished through a non-title V federally-enforceable State operating permit program. This type of permit program, and its basic elements, are described in guidance published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1989 (54 FR 27274). In short, the program must: (a) be approved into the SIP, (b) impose legal obligations to conform to the permit limitations, (c) provide for limits that are enforceable as a practical matter, (d) be issued in a process that provides for review and an opportunity for comment by the public and by EPA, and (e) ensure that there is no relaxation of otherwise applicable Federal requirements. The EPA believes that these type of programs can be used for both criteria pollutants and hazardous air pollutants, as described in the memorandum, "Approaches to Creating Federally-Enforceable Emissions Limits," November 3, 1993. This memorandum (referred to below as the November 1993 memorandum) is included for your information as Attachment 1. There are a number of important clarifications with respect to hazardous air pollutants subsequent to the November 1993 memorandum which are discussed below (see section entitled "Limitations on Hazardous Air Pollutants").

2. Limitations established by rules. For less complex plant sites, and for source categories involving relatively few operations that are relatively similar in nature, case-by-case permitting may not be the most administratively efficient approach to establishing federally-enforceable restrictions. One approach that has been used is to establish a general rule which creates federally-enforceable restrictions at one time for many sources (these rules have been referred to as "exclusionary" rules and by some permitting agencies as "prohibitory" rules). A specific suggested approach for volatile organic compounds (VOC) limits by rule was described in EPA's memorandum dated October 15, 1993 entitled "Guidance for State Rules for Optional Federally-Enforceable Emissions Limits Based Upon Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Use." An example of such an exclusionary rule is a model rule developed for use in California. (The California model rule is attached, along with a discussion of its applicability to other situations--

¹This is not an exhaustive list of considerations affecting potential to emit. Other federally-enforceable limits can be used, for example, source-specific SIP revisions. For brevity, we have included those which have the widest applicability.

see Attachment 2). Exclusionary rules are included in a State's SIP and generally become effective upon approval by EPA.

3. General permits. A concept similar to the exclusionary rule is the establishment of a general permit for a given source type. A general permit is a single permit that establishes terms and conditions that must be complied with by all sources subject to that permit. The establishment of a general permit provides for conditions limiting potential to emit in a one-time permitting process, and thus avoids the need to issue separate permits for each source within the covered source type or category. Although this concept is generally thought of as an element of a title V permit program, there is no reason that a State or local agency could not submit a general permit program as a SIP submittal aimed at creating potential to emit limits for groups of sources. Additionally, general permits can be issued under the auspices of a SIP-approved FESOP. The advantage of a general permit, when compared to an exclusionary rule, is that upon approval by EPA of the State's permit program, a general permit could be written for one or more additional source types without triggering the need for the formal SIP revision process.

4. Construction permits. Another type of case-by-case permit is a construction permit. These permits generally cover new and modified sources, and States have developed such permit programs as an element of their SIP's. As described in the November 1993 memorandum, these State major and minor new source review (NSR) construction permits can provide for federally-enforceable limitations on a source's potential to emit. Further discussion of the use of minor source NSR programs is contained in EPA's letter to Jason Grumet, NESCAUM, dated November 2, 1994, which is contained in Attachment 3. As noted in this letter, the usefulness of minor NSR programs for the creation of potential to emit limitations can vary from State to State, and is somewhat dependent on the scope of a State's program.

5. Title V permits. Operating permits issued under the Federal title V operating permits program can, in some cases, provide a convenient and readily available mechanism to create federally-enforceable limits. Although the applicability date for part 70 permit programs is generally the driving force for most of the current concerns with respect to potential to emit, there are other programs, such as the section 112 air toxics program, for which title V permits may themselves be a useful mechanism for creating potential to emit limits. For example, many sources will be considered to be major by virtue of combustion emissions of nitrogen oxides or sulfur dioxide, and will be required to obtain part 70 permits. Such permits could be used to establish federally-enforceable limitations that could ensure that the source is not considered a major source of hazardous air pollutants.

Practicable Enforceability

If limitations--whether imposed by SIP rules or through individual or general permits--are incomplete or vague or unsupported by appropriate compliance records, enforcement by the States, citizens and EPA would not be effective. Consequently, in all cases, limitations and restrictions must be of sufficient quality and quantity to ensure accountability (see 54 FR 27283).

The EPA has issued several guidance documents explaining the requirements of practicable enforceability (e.g., "Guidance on Limiting Potential to Emit in New Source Permitting," June 13, 1989; memorandum from John Rasnic entitled "Policy Determination on Limiting Potential to Emit for Koch Refining Company's Clean Fuels Project," March 13, 1992). In general, practicable enforceability for a source-specific permit means that the permit's provisions must specify: (1) A technically-accurate limitation and the portions of the source subject to the limitation; (2) the time period for the limitation (hourly, daily, monthly, and annual limits such as rolling annual limits); and (3) the method to determine compliance including appropriate monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting. For rules and general permits that apply to categories of sources, practicable enforceability additionally requires that the provisions: (1) identify the types or categories of sources that are covered by the rule; (2) where coverage is optional, provide for notice to the permitting authority of the source's election to be covered by the rule; and (3) specify the enforcement consequences relevant to the rule. More specific guidance on these enforceability principles as they apply to rules and general permits is provided in Attachment 4.

Limitations on Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP)

There are a number of important points to recognize with respect to the ability of existing State and local programs to create limitations for the 189 HAP listed in (or pursuant to) section 112(b) of the Act, consistent with the definitions of "potential to emit" and "federally-enforceable" in 40 CFR 63.2 (promulgated March 16, 1994, 59 FR 12408 in the part 63 General Provisions). The EPA believes that most State and local programs should have broad capabilities to handle the great majority of situations for which a potential to emit limitation on HAP is needed.

First, it is useful to note that the definition of potential to emit for the Federal air toxics program (see the subpart A "general provisions," section 63.2) considers, for purposes of controlling HAP emissions, federally-enforceable limitations on criteria pollutant emissions if "the effect such limitations would have on "[hazardous air pollutant] . . . emissions" is federally-enforceable (emphasis added). There are many examples of such criteria pollutant emission limits that are present in federally-enforceable State and local permits and rules. Examples would include a limitation constraining an operation to one (time limit specified) shift per day or limitations that effectively limit operations to 2000 hours per year. Other examples would include limitations on the amount of material used, for example a permit limitation constraining an operation to using no more than 100 gallons of paint per month. Additionally, federally-enforceable permit terms that, for example, required an incinerator to be operated and maintained at no less than 1600 degrees would have an obvious "effect" on the HAP present in the inlet stream.

Another federally-enforceable way criteria pollutant limitations affect HAP can be described as a "nested" HAP limit within a permit containing conditions limiting criteria pollutants. For example, the particular VOC's within a given operation may include toluene and xylene, which are also HAP. If the VOC-limiting permit has established limitations on the amount of toluene and xylene used as the means to reduce VOC, those limitations would have an obvious

"effect" on HAP as well.

In cases as described above, the "effect" of criteria pollutant limits will be straightforward. In other cases, information may be needed on the nature of the HAP stream present. For example, a limit on VOC that ensured total VOC's of 20 tons per year may not ensure that each HAP present is less than 10 tons per year without further investigation. While the EPA intends to develop further technical guidance on situations for which additional permit terms and conditions may be needed to ensure that the "effect" is enforceable as a practical matter, the EPA intends to rely on State and local agencies to employ care in drafting enforceable requirements which recognize obvious environmental and health concerns.

There are, of course, a few important pollutants which are HAP but are not criteria pollutants. Example of these would include methylene chloride and other pollutants which are considered nonreactive and therefore exempt from coverage as VOC's. Especially in cases where such pollutants are the only pollutants present, criteria pollutant emission limitations may not be sufficient to limit HAP. For such cases, the State or local agency will need to seek program approval under section 112(l) of the Act.

Section 112(l) provides a clear mechanism for approval of State and local air toxics programs for purposes of establishing HAP-specific PTE limits. The EPA intends, where appropriate, that in approving permitting programs into the SIP, to add appropriate language citing approval pursuant to section 112(l) as well. An example illustrating section 112(l) approval is the approval of the State of Ohio's program for limiting potential to emit (see 59 FR 53587, October 25, 1994). In this notice, EPA granted approval under section 112(l) for hazardous air pollutants aspects of a State program for limiting potential to emit. Such language can be added to any federally-enforceable State operating permit program, exclusionary rule, or NSR program update SIP approval notice so long as the State or local program has the authority to regulate HAP and meets other section 112(l) approval criteria. Transition issues related to such section 112(l) approvals are discussed below.

Determination of Maximum Capacity

While EPA and States have been calculating potential to emit for a number of years, EPA believes that it is important at this time to provide some clarification on what is meant in the definition of potential to emit by the "maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit under its physical and operational design." Clearly, there are sources for which inherent physical limitations for the operation restrict the potential emissions of individual emission units. Where such inherent limitations can be documented by a source and confirmed by the permitting agency, EPA believes that States have the authority to make such judgements and factor them into estimates of a stationary source's potential to emit.

The EPA believes that the most straightforward examples of such inherent limitations is for single-emission unit type operations. For example, EPA does not believe that the "maximum capacity" language requires that owner of a paint spray booth at a small auto body shop must

assume that (even if the source could be in operation year-round) spray equipment is operated 8760 hours per year in cases where there are inherent physical limitations on the number of cars that can be painted within any given period of time. For larger sources involving multiple emissions units and complex operations, EPA believes it can be more problematic to identify the inherent limitations that may exist.

The EPA intends, within its resource constraints, to issue technical assistance in this area by providing information on the type of operational limits that may be considered acceptable to limit the potential to emit for certain individual small source categories.

Transition Guidance for Section 112 and Title V Applicability

Most, if not all, States have recognized the need to develop options for limiting the potential emissions of sources and are moving forward with one or more of the strategies described in the preceding sections in conjunction with the submission and implementation of their part 70 permit programs. However, EPA is aware of the concern of States and sources that title V or section 112 implementation will move ahead of the development and implementation of these options, leaving sources with actual emissions clearly below the major source thresholds potentially subject to part 70 and other major source requirements. Gaps could theoretically occur during the time period it takes for a State program to be designed and administratively adopted by the State, approved into the SIP by EPA, and implemented as needed to cover individual sources.

The EPA is committed to aiding all States in developing and implementing adequate, streamlined, and cost-effective vehicles for creating federally-enforceable limits on a source's potential emissions by the time that section 112 or title V requirements become effective. To help bridge any gaps, EPA will expedite its reviews of State exclusionary rules and operating permit rules by, among other things, coordinating the approval of these rules with the approval of the State's part 70 program and by using expeditious approval approaches such as "direct final" Federal Register notices to ensure that approval of these programs does not lag behind approval of the part 70 program.

In addition, in such approval notices EPA will affirm any limits established under the State's program since its adoption by the State but prior to Federal approval if such limits were established in accordance with the procedures and requirements of the approved program. An example of language affirming such limits was recently used in approving an Illinois SIP revision (see 57 FR 59931, included as Attachment 5).

The EPA remains concerned that even with expedited approvals and other strategies, sources may face gaps in the ability to acquire federally-enforceable potential to emit limits due to delays in State adoption or EPA approval of programs or in their implementation. In order to ensure that such gaps do not create adverse consequences for States or for sources, EPA is announcing a transition policy for a period up to two years from the date of this memorandum. The EPA intends to make this transition policy available at the discretion of the State or local

agency to the extent there are sources which the State believes can benefit from such a transition policy. The transition period will extend from now until the gaps in program implementation are filled, but no later than January 1997. Today's guidance, which EPA intends to codify through a notice and comment rulemaking, provides States discretion to use the following options for satisfying potential to emit requirements during this transition period.

1. Sources maintaining emissions below 50 percent of all applicable major source requirements. For sources that typically and consistently maintain emissions significantly below major source levels, relatively few benefits would be gained by making such sources subject to major source requirements under the Act. For this reason, many States are developing exclusionary rules and general permits to create simple, streamlined means to ensure that these sources are not considered major sources. To ease the burden on States' implementation of title V, and to ensure that delays in EPA's approval of these types of programs will not cause an administrative burden on the States, EPA is providing a 2-year transition period for sources that maintain their actual emissions, for every consecutive 12-month period (beginning with the 12 months immediately preceding the date of this memorandum), at levels that do not exceed 50 percent of any and all of the major stationary source thresholds applicable to that source. A source that exceeds the 50 percent threshold, without complying with major source requirements of the Act (or without otherwise limiting its potential to emit), could be subject to enforcement. For this 2-year period, such sources (i.e., those emitting under the 50 percent threshold) would not be treated as major sources and would not be required to obtain a permit that limits their potential to emit. To qualify under this transition policy, sources must maintain adequate records on site to demonstrate that emissions are maintained below these thresholds for the entire transition period. Consistent with the California approach, EPA believes it is appropriate for the amount of recordkeeping to vary according to the level of emissions (see paragraphs 1.2 and 4.2 of the attached rule).

2. Larger sources with State limits. For the 2-year transition period, restrictions contained in State permits issued to sources above the 50 percent threshold would be treated by EPA as acceptable limits on potential to emit, provided: (a) the permit is enforceable as a practical matter; (b) the source owner submits a written certification to EPA that it will comply with

the limits as a restriction on its potential to emit; and (c) the source owner, in the certification, accepts Federal and citizen enforcement of the limits (this is appropriate given that the limits are being taken to avoid otherwise applicable Federal requirements). Such limits will be valid for purposes of limiting potential to emit from the date the certification is received by EPA until the end of the transition period. States interested in making use of this portion of the transition policy should work with their Regional Office to develop an appropriate certification process.

3. Limits for noncriteria HAP. For noncriteria HAP for which no existing federally-approved program is available for the creation of federally-enforceable limits, the 2-year transition period provides for sufficient time to gain approval pursuant to section 112(l). For the 2-year transition period, State restrictions on such noncriteria pollutants issued to sources with emissions above the 50 percent threshold would be treated by EPA as limiting a source's potential to emit, provided that:

(a) the restrictions are enforceable as a practical matter; (b) the source owner submits a written certification to EPA that it will comply with the limits as a restriction on its potential to emit; and (c) the source owner, in the certification, accepts Federal and citizen enforcement of the limits. Such limits will be valid for purposes of limiting potential to emit from the date the certification is received by EPA until the end of the transition period.

The Regional Offices should send this memorandum, including the attachments, to States within their jurisdiction. Questions concerning specific issues and cases should be directed to the appropriate Regional Office. Regional Office staff may contact Timothy Smith of the Integrated Implementation Group at 919-541-4718, or Clara Poffenberger with the Air Enforcement Division at 202-564-8709.

Attachments

cc: Air Branch Chief, Region I-X
Regional Counsels